



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,170	01/02/2007	Marcello Puggioni	154546/0341-073	5190
86661	7590	07/22/2010		
Potomac Patent Group PLLC P.O. Box 270 Fredericksburg, VA 22404		EXAMINER WHITE, DWAYNE J		
		ART UNIT 3745		PAPER NUMBER
		NOTIFICATION DATE 07/22/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

tammy@ppglaw.com
gpo.mail@ge.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/572,170	Applicant(s) PUGGIONI ET AL.
	Examiner DWAYNE J. WHITE	Art Unit 3745

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED 28 June 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-13.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 6/4/2010

13. Other: See Continuation Sheet

/Edward K. Look/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3745

Continuation of 13. Other: In regards to Applicant's arguments to the rejection of claims 1-11 and 13 as being anticipated by Lorenzen, Applicant asserts that since Lorenzen's disclosed device is used to heat a dry gas seal and even if Lorenzen's heater is capable of cooling the gas seal, Lorenzen does not describe such a feature. Applicant goes on to assert there is no extrinsic evidence that the missing characteristic of the function of cooling the seal is not present and therefore inherency cannot be invoked. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner reiterates that Applicant claims not structural feature that is different from the structure of Lorenzen. The only difference is Applicant's intention to use a cooling fluid rather than a heating fluid. Applicant has not shown that Lorenzen is incapable of providing a cooling fluid nor has Applicant shown that the structure of Lorenzen is significantly different other than to Applicant's intended use. Thus the Examiner has maintained that Lorenzen is inherently capable of providing a cooling fluid and the rejection under 35 USC 102(b) is proper. In regards to the rejection of claim 12 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, the Examiner points out that having the two temperatures mentioned in the specification at different points does not support that heat exchanger claimed by Applicant is capable of cooling within that range. Furthermore, page 5, lines 19-20 at best only support a temperature of 100 degrees Celcius since the specification appears to state that the acceptable temperature is 100 degrees. Therefore, a range of temperatures is not support and thus the rejection is maintained.